

RemarksClaim rejections - 35 USC § 112

The dependencies of claims 10, 13 and 22 have been corrected as suggested by the Examiner. The Examiner is thanked for his attention to detail.

Claim rejections - 35 USC § 103

In paragraph 5 of the Office Action the Examiner rejects claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9-17, 21-23 as being unpatentable over Hirota in view of Busardo. Reconsideration is requested.

The present invention gives the advantage that human-like intonation is produced by an automated system for "speaking" alphanumeric characters in sequences. Intonation is defined at page 7 lines 21-22 of the present application as modulation or rise and fall in pitch. Neither Hirota nor Busardo describe producing intonation in this way. The independent claims of the present application are amended to make this distinction clear and to specify more detail about how this is achieved. It is respectfully submitted that the claims as amended are now patentable over the cited references.

Intonation is achieved by using a plurality of fragments for the same alphanumeric character. Those fragments are recordings of that same alphanumeric character as spoken at different locations within an utterance. The independent claims and also claims 12 and 13 have been amended to make this clear.

By using information in the template to select the particular fragments to use intonation is then achieved. In contrast, Hirota mentions "reading" alphabetic portions only in a monotone manner (column 6 lines 45-47). Also, Hirota has no fragments for the same alphanumeric character as spoken at different locations in an utterance.

Busardo has no mechanism for intonation production either. Thus the skilled person would not have been able to reach the present invention by combining Hirota and Busardo.


The Examiner argues that the audio allophones (column 3 lines 25-27) of Busardo are the same as the fragments claimed in the present invention. However, this is not the case because the audio allophones of Busardo are portions of recorded spoken words (column 3 line 3), not recordings of a spoken alphanumeric character.

For those reasons it is respectfully submitted that the independent claims are allowable as are the dependent claims by virtue of their dependency. Arguments about all the individual dependent claims have not been presented but the Examiner's rejections are traversed.

Further and favorable reconsideration is therefore urged.

April 21, 2004

Respectfully submitted,



William M. Lee, Jr.
Registration No. 26,935
Barnes & Thornburg
P.O. Box 2786
Chicago, Illinois 60690-2786
(312) 214-4800
(312) 759-5646 (fax)